



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/709,339	04/29/2004	Do-Kyoung Kwon	MTKP0170USA	3338
27765	7590	07/18/2008	EXAMINER	
NORTH AMERICA INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY CORPORATION			VO, TUNG T	
P.O. BOX 506			ART UNIT	
MERRIFIELD, VA 22116			PAPER NUMBER	
			2621	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	
			DELIVERY MODE	
			07/18/2008	
			ELECTRONIC	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

winstonhsu.uspto@gmail.com
Patent.admin.uspto.Rcv@naipo.com
mis.ap.uspto@naipo.com.tw

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/709,339	Applicant(s) KWON ET AL.	
	Examiner Tung Vo	Art Unit 2621	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 18-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 5-17 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 April 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>02/22/08</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 05/19/2008 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-3 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Joch et al. (US 7,227,901).

Re claim 1, Joch discloses a method for reducing a blocking artifact in a video stream (fig. 5), the method comprising: determining a region mode to be one of active region (p0...p3; q0...q3 are activities pixels blocks of fig. 3a, wherein determination of the activity on the line (boundary line, 47 of fig. 3a) is above or below the activity threshold; fig. 3b), smooth region (smooth areas, col. 14, lines 38-47), or dormant region (120 and 122 of fig. 5, inter and intra

Art Unit: 2621

regions are considered as dormant regions) for the block boundary in the video stream (112 of fig. 5); and

filtering (44 of fig. 4, 120-134 of fig. 5) a plurality of pixels around the block boundary to reduce the blocking artifact according to the region mode; wherein filtering the pixels around the block boundary comprises first filtering the pixels at the block boundary (120, YES, 122 of fig. 5, note default filter (122 of fig. 5) is applied to p0 and q0 samples and the filtered result in P0 and Q0) and next filtering pixels not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary (124-134 of fig. 5, filter P0, P1, and in step 130 of fig. 5 suggest the filtering pixels (P1 and P0) not adjacent to the pixels);

when filtering the pixels not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary (128-134 of fig. 5; see also figs. 3b and 6), there is at least one pixel left unfiltered (fig. 3b, the determined and selected pixels are filtered, the remained or left pixels are not filtered by doing so is to reduce a computation in filtering processes) between the pixels around the block boundary (p0 and q0 of fig. 3a) and the pixels not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary (p2-p1, q1-q2 of figures 3a and 3b are considered as not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary).

Re claim 2, Joch further discloses wherein filtering the plurality of pixels further comprises filtering pixels at the block boundary (116 of fig. 5), filtering pixels away from the block boundary (122 of fig. 5, not intra coded block), and then filtering remaining pixels between the pixels at the block boundary (intra coded block, Yes, 120 of fig. 5, then filtering, 128-134 of fig. 5) and the pixels away from the block boundary (122 of fig. 5), wherein the filter (44 of fig.

4) would be able to filter the pixels adjacent the boundary block and the pixels away from the boundary block (fig. 3b)

Re claim 3, Joch further discloses wherein determining the region mode for the block boundary between the adjacent blocks in the video stream further comprises: calculating an activity value representing the local activity around the block boundary (col. 13, lines 45-50; 112 of fig. 5); and determining the region mode (120 of fig. 5) according to the activity value.

Re claim 19, Joch further discloses determining a filtering range according to block coding types (inter or intra coding types, col. 11, lines 1-11) of the adjacent blocks in the video stream; wherein the filtering range specifies a number of pixels to filter around the block boundary (col. 11, lines 8-11, wherein inter coded (not intra coded) block size ranging from 16x16 pixels to 4x4 pixels, so the intra-coded block size would obviously 4x4 pixels).

Re claim 20, Joch further discloses wherein according to the block coding types (inter coded block size ranging 16x16 pixels to 4x4 pixels; intra code block size 4x4 pixels to zero; col. 11, lines 8-11) of the adjacent blocks in the video stream, determining the filtering range to be up to eight pixels around the block boundary (25 and 47 of fig. 3a).

Re claim 21, Joch discloses wherein determining a filtering range according to the block coding types of the adjacent blocks in the video stream (col. 11, lines 8-11) further comprises: if at least one of the adjacent blocks is an intra-coded block (Each inter-coded macroblock 24 can be partitioned in a number of different ways, using blocks of seven different sizes, with luminance block sizes ranging from 16.times.16 pixels to 4.times.4 pixels, col. 11, lines 8-11, this would obviously suggest the intra coded , where block size would be 4x4 pixels), determining the filtering range to be up to four pixels around the block boundary; and if none of

Art Unit: 2621

the adjacent blocks are intra-coded blocks (intra coded blocks, col. 11, lines 8-11), determining the filtering range to be up to eight pixels around the block boundary (16x16 pixels to 4x4 pixels, col. 11, lines 8-11).

Re claim 22, Joch discloses wherein the video stream is an MPEG video stream (25 of fig. 29).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joch et al. (US 7,227,901) in view of Ameres et al. (US 7,027,654).

Re claim 4, Joch teaches the content activity measure is derived from the absolute value of the separation between sample values of p0, p1, q0, q1 on either side of the boundary 47 (col. 13, lines 23-28) .

It is noted that Joch does not particularly teach wherein calculating the activity value comprises summing absolute differences between pixels V around the block boundary as follows:

$$\text{ACTIVITY} = \sum_{i=0}^4 |p_i - p_{i-1}| + \sum_{i=0}^{12} |q_i - q_{i-1}|$$

Art Unit: 2621

However, Ameres teaches calculating the activity value (col. 5, lines 1-10) comprises summing absolute differences between pixels V around the block boundary using the formulas (col. 5, lines 1-10) follows:

$$Side1SAD = \sum_{i=1}^4 \text{abs}(x_i - x_{i-1})$$

$$Side2SAD = \sum_{i=5}^8 \text{abs}(x_i - x_{i-1})$$

Taking the teachings of Joch and Ameres as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the teachings of Ameres into the method of Joch in order to reduce the decoder complexity on vector processing machines that are capable of doing the same operation to multiple values stored sequentially in a machine's registers by lowering the complexity of the 2 dimensional transform and decoding time.

6. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joch et al. (US 7,227,901) in view of Hsu et al. (US 2005/0013497).

Re claim 18, Joch further teaches if the video stream comprises video frame, performing an interpolation operation to estimate pixel values in frames before filtering the pixels around the block boundary (col. 11, lines 27-29). Joch does not particularly teach if the video stream comprises interlaced video, performing an interpolation operation to estimate pixel values in an interlaced field before filtering the pixels around the block boundary as claimed.

Hsu teaches a video decoder decodes a motion vector for a current interlaced macroblock (e.g., a frame or field macroblock) and obtains a prediction macroblock for the current macroblock using the decoded motion vector [0043], this would obviously suggest if the video stream comprises interlaced video, performing an interpolation operation to estimate pixel values in an interlaced field.

Therefore, taking the teachings of Joch and Hsu as a whole, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Hsu into the method of Joch in order to provide rounding leads to lower implementation costs by favoring less complicated positions for interpolation (e.g., integer and half-integer locations).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 05/19/2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The applicant pointed out that the examiner should have been reject claims 1-3 and 19-22 using 35 USC 102. It was noted that there is typographical error of the header of the previous rejection, and now claims 1-3 and 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) above.

The applicant argues that Joch does not disclose filtering the pixels at the boundary and pixels not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary, and there is at least one pixel left unfiltered between the pixels around the block boundary and the pixels not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary, pages 11-15 of re remarks.

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant. It is submitted that Joch discloses filtering the pixels at the boundary (122 of fig. 5, a default filter applies to p0 and q0, which are

Art Unit: 2621

filtering the pixels (p0 and q0) at the boundary (47 of fig. 3a) and pixels not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary (p1 and p2, 130 of fig. 5, filtering the pixels not adjacent to the pixels at boundary), and there is at least one pixel left unfiltered between the pixels around the block boundary and the pixels not adjacent to the pixels at the block boundary (124-134 of fig. 5, filter P0, P1, and in step 130 of fig. 5 suggest the filtering pixels (P1 and P0) not adjacent to the pixels).

Allowable Subject Matter

8. Claims 5-17 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

Either Joch, Hsu, or Ameres does not particularly teach or suggest if at least one of the adjacent blocks is an intra-coded block:

if the activity value is greater than a first threshold, determining the region mode to be an active region;

if the activity value is less than the first threshold but greater than a second threshold, determining the region mode to be a smooth region; and

if the activity value is less than the second threshold, determining the region mode to be a dormant region; and

if none of the adjacent blocks are intra-coded blocks:

if the activity value is greater than a third threshold, determining the region mode to be an active region;

Art Unit: 2621

if the activity value is less than the third threshold but greater than the second threshold, determining the region mode to be a smooth region; and

if the activity value is less than the second threshold, determining the region mode to be a dormant region as specified in claim 5.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tung Vo whose telephone number is 571-272-7340. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Tung Vo/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2621